

Appl. No. : 10/618,900
Filed : July 14, 2003

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Rudy Zervigon for the courteous telephone interview extended to their representative that was conducted on February 8, 2007.

Exhibits or demonstrations shown

None.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

Hayakawa (US 5,447,568) and Kajita (US 5,653,634) were discussed.

Proposed Amendments

The Examiner suggested that the word “in the vicinity of” in the sentence “said vaporization surface having pores distributed exclusively in the vicinity of its periphery” in claim 1 be deleted.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

The word “exclusively” and the word “in the vicinity of” in claim 1 could be contradicted. If it is read as “exclusively at”, Hayakawa teaches away from that structure (said vaporization surface having pores distributed exclusively at its periphery). Kajita also does not teach that structure.

Results of Interview

The Examiner agreed that the word “exclusively at” could distinguish the claimed structures from the prior art.